

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,641
Docket No.: 9330-US-375

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsieh (U. S. Patent 6,683,948). Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, and 7. Applicant has also added claims 14-16. After entry of amendments, claims 1-16 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsieh. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, and 7 and added claims 14-16. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

In the present invention as shown in FIG. 3, the amplifier 302 is used to for example amplify the signals and also reshaped the signals. Therefore, the ADC 304 can choose the one with low precision level to just preserve the frequency spectrum without to preserve the amplitude. These features have been clearly recited in amended independent claims 1, 4 and 7.

Also and, due to the specific design, the precision level of the ADC can be just about 4-8 bits without high precision level.

In re Hsieh, as shown in Fig. 1, the amplifier 16 actually is a pre-amplifier (col. 3, line 22). The pre-

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,641
Docket No.: 9330-US-375

amplifier does not disclose the amplifier of the present invention to amplify and reshape the signals.

Further still, Hsieh never discloses that the ADC is used to just preserve the frequency spectrum but not the amplitude as recited in claims 1, 4 and 7.

Further, with respect to newly added claims 14-16, Hsieh never discloses that the precision level of the ADC can be about 4-8 bits to just preserve the frequency spectrum without caring too much on the amplitude.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 4 and 7 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, and 8-16 patently define over the prior art references as well.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/064,641
Docket No.: 9330-US-375

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-16 of the invention patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Oct. 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw
Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw